

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 19 are pending. By this response, Claims 1, 9, 13, 17 and 18 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryan I-chuen Lee, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,553) in view of John R. Nicholson (“Sams Teach Yourself Outlook 98 in 24 Hours”) and further in view of Yougi Kawamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,889,246). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

For reasons of brevity, Applicants remarks filed in the response dated September 12, 2005, with regards to Lee and Nicholson are hereby incorporated by reference.

Each of independent claims 1, 9, 13, 17 and 18 recite, *inter alia*, “wherein the plurality of different types of communications include at least email, telephone and Internet communications.” Applicants respectfully submit that Lee, Nicholson and Kawamoto fail to teach this feature of the claims.

Lee teaches an electronic mail system in which a user can send a request and view whether the recipient of the request has responded to that request and in what manner they have responded. The user determines if the recipient has read the emails by a marked indication. Nicholson teaches an email system (Outlook 98) that provides an indication of the email message status. Both Lee and Nicholson systems are directed to email communications, not email, telephone and Internet communications.

The Office Action applies Nicholson to teach the claimed answering state and whether the answer has been completed or not. Applicants submit that Nicholson email system is directed to displaying data associated with email, therefore only one type of communication device.

The Office Action applies Kawamoto to teach the claimed “displaying communication history from a plurality of different types of communication, in connection with an answering state,” absent in the teachings of Lee and Nicholson. Applicants respectfully submit that the Kawamoto does not teach this particular feature of Applicants’ claims.

Kawamoto teaches a network system which provides information to various communication devices. Kawamoto’s system displays each of the users in the network and the type of communication device that the user is connected to the network. Kawamoto teaches that the different communication devices are a television, phone or computer, and not email, telephone and Internet communications, as recited in the independent claims.

. The display of the terminal device is used for determining how to format data so that it can be displayed on the particular device from which the user is connected to the network. The display of the plurality of communications is not made in conjunction with communication history or an answering state of communication. Although the Examiner refers to Kawamoto to teach “a plurality of different types of communications,” (see Office Action, page 4), the display of the plurality of communications of Applicants’ claims is in context with a connection history and answering state, not just simply displaying the types of the communications. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Kawamoto fails to teach Applicants’ claimed features when viewed in conjunction with the entirety of the claim language.

Further, there is no motivation in Lee or Nicholson or by one of ordinary in the art to modify the teachings of Lee and Nicholson to display any other type of communications in conjunction with the communication history and answering state beyond use of email communication. Both Lee and Nicholson are dedicated to email operations. One of ordinary skill would not look to a reference such as Nicholson directed to Outlook 98 (email software) to encompass other types of communications. One of ordinary skill would not look to combine teachings of references such as Lee and Nicholson that concern only email applications with a feature of a display terminal device that displays the communication device used by each user merely for determining the correct formatting of data sent to those respective devices. Nowhere does Lee or Nicholson teach or suggest modifying its teachings beyond email applications. Further, nowhere does Kawamoto teach or suggest modifying systems concerned with email applications to include other communication devices. Simply because Kawamoto displays other communication devices in its particular system, which is dedicated to a different operation than email operation, does not suggest that these devices can be used in the apparatus and systems of Lee and Nicholson nor does it suggest or teach displaying a communication history for those devices in connection with an answering state.

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of references fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, an information history list display section capable of display section capable of displaying communication history from a plurality of different types of communications, in connection with an answering state, wherein the plurality of different types of communications include at least email, telephone and Internet communications, as recited in Claim 1.

Also, the combination of Lee and Nicholson's teachings fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a personal information management section for transmitting, in response to a request from an information terminal that is capable of displaying respective communications, from a plurality of different types of communications, which belong to each of the information terminal users, and in connection with an answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, of the respective communications based on history related information which is generated by outgoing or incoming communication, requested information to said information terminal, wherein the plurality of different types of communications include at least email, telephone and Internet communications, as recited in claim 9.

The combination of Lee and Nicholson's teachings also fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, an information management table capable of recording history related information from a plurality of different types of communications, which is generated by outgoing or incoming communication and indicates an answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, of the respective communications stored in said history management section; and an information history list display section for displaying the respective communications in connection with the answering state of the respective communications based on the history related information stored in said information management table, wherein the plurality of different types of communications include at least email, telephone and Internet communications, as recited in claim 13.

The teachings of Lee and Nicholson also fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, recording communication history of respective communications, from a plurality of different types of communications; recording history related information which is generated by outgoing or

incoming communication and indicates an answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, of the respective communications; and displaying the respective communications in connection with the answering state of the respective communications based on the history related information, wherein the plurality of different types of communications include at least email, telephone and Internet communications, as recited in claim 17.

Finally, the combination of Lee and Nicholson's teachings fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, at least one information processor capable of maintaining a record of communication history information indicating an answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, of each item wherein said communication history information being generated from a plurality of different types of communications, wherein the plurality of different types of communications include at least email, telephone and Internet communications, as recited in claim 18.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that motivation for combining the teachings of Nicholson and Lee with Kawamoto is absent in the references or by one of ordinary skill as discussed above.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 9, 13, 17 and 18 are distinguishable over the cited art. Dependent Claims 2-8, 10-12, 14-16 and 19-20 are also distinguishable over the cited art for the reasons above as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.


### CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: May 15, 2006

By  
D. Richard Anderson  
Registration No.: 40,439  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant